1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF ZONOLITE, DIV. OF W. R. GRACE & CO., 4 PCHB No. 317 Appellant, 5 FINDINGS OF FACT. vs. 6 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent. 9

10

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

A formal hearing on the appeal of Zonolite Division of W. R. Grace & Co. to a Notice of Civil Penalty of \$50.00 for an alleged smoke emission violation came on before the Board, all members present, with Walt Woodward presiding, on May 22, 1973, in Seattle, Washington.

Appellant appeared by and through Donald L. Schmid, its plant superintendent; respondent appeared by and through its attorney Keith D. McGoffin.

Having heard the testimony, and considered the exhibits, and being fully advised, the Board makes the following:

## FINDINGS OF FACT

2

1

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

2223

24 25

26

S F No 9928-A

FINDIN S OF FACT, 27 | CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

AND OF SR

I.

The Zonolite Division of W. R. Grace & Co. (appellants herein) conducts its business from its plant located in Auburn, Washington. It operates with a gas fired furnace and a stand by oil system. February 2, 1973, appellant was operating its plant by use of its fuel oil system.

II.

On February 2, 1973, appellant caused or allowed smoke to be emitted from a stack on its plant for 15 1/2 consecutive minutes of a shade darker than number 2 on the Ringelmann Chart, namely a Ringelmann varying between number 3 and 5.

III.

Section 9.03(a) of Respondent's Regulation I makes it unlawful to cause or allow the emission of an air contaminant darker in shade than number 2 on the Ringelmann Chart for more than three minutes in any hour.

IV.

Although the cause of the smoke was from a malfunction of its equipment, appellant did not notify Respondent of its break-lown.

From which, comes these

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

Appellant was in violation of Section 9.03(a) of Respondent's Regulation 1.

2

1	II.
2	The amount of the civil penalty, being one-fifth of the maximum
3	allowed, is reasonable.
4	From which follows the Board's
5	ORDER
6	The appeal is denied and the civil penalty is affirmed.
7	DATED this 5th day of une, 1973.
8	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
9	Walt Handward
10	WALT WOODWARD, Chairman
11	Ul Thisbley
12	W. A. GISSBERG, Member
13	
14	JAMES T. SHEEHY, Member
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
`5	
26	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
27	AND ORDER 3